





LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS

See pages 178 18. 5

THE

BURIALS BILL.

CORRESPONDENCE

BETWEEN THE

REV. T. J. HUGHES, M.A.

RECTOR OF LLANBEDR,

AND

MR. OSBORNE MORGAN, M.P.

WITH SUPPLEMENTARY REMARKS.

[Re-printed from the *Wrexham Guardian*.]

WREXHAM:

Printed and Published by J. VAUGHAN, "Guardian" Office:



THE BURIALS BILL.

To the Editor of the *Wrexham Guardian*.

Sir,—I shall be obliged by your inserting the enclosed correspondence, between Mr. Osborne Morgan and myself, in your *Guardian*.

Llanbedr Rectory.

T. J. HUGHES.

“ Llanbedr Rectory, Ruthin,

Feb. 1, 1872.

“ Dear Sir,—Personally I have no right to trespass upon your time; but, as one of no inconsiderable number of your constituents, who are at least unfortunate in having you as their Representative in Parliament—as a Churchman—I may perhaps ask the favour of an explanation as to an assertion made recently by you at a public meeting in the County. You are reported in the *North Wales Chronicle* of January 13th, to have stated in a speech to your constituents at Wrexham, that ‘the Churchman possesses a valid, I might say odious, right to read over the body of a deceased parishioner a funeral service which, had he been alive, would have been most abhorrent to his feelings, and which, in nine cases out of ten, is abhorrent also to the feelings of his relatives.’

“ May I ask you to point out *definitely* what there is in the Burial Service of the Church, which can, upon any reasonable ground, be ‘abhorrent to the feelings’ of any rightly-constituted religious mind? During a parochial ministry extending now over 25 years, it has fallen to my lot frequently to celebrate this service over the remains of persons, who had belonged to various Dissent-

ing Communion, if I may so describe them, and again and again have I had occasion to observe how the solemn words of that sublime service have administered comfort most true to many an aching heart, and soothed many a heaving bosom ; but *never*—I use the word deliberately—have I seen the least indication that the service has been ‘most abhorrent to the feelings’ of mourning relatives ; and this is the first time I have heard any imputation of the kind.

“Dissenters have made it a ground of objection to the Rubric, that a service so full of Christian hope and comfort should be read over the remains of all *indiscriminately*, and Churchmen have sometimes felt the force of this objection. But this is not your point of view. You would contend, I presume, that the Dissenting parishioner, whom you consider wronged, had died in the ‘true faith of Christ ;’ and granting this to be the case, I ask again, What is there in the Burial Service of the Church which can justify your description of it as being ‘most abhorrent’ to the religious feelings of anyone, or of the relatives of anyone, calling himself a Christian, though a Nonconformist ?

“I can quite understand an Infidel or Secularist denouncing the right to use the Burial Service over his remains as ‘odious ;’ but I am wholly at a loss to conceive how you can reconcile the use of this opprobrious epithet, either with the facts of the case, or with the convictions of your own conscience, if I am right in assuming you to be a member of that Church, whose Burial Service you have thus publicly denounced.

I remain, yours truly,

“T. J. HUGHES.

“G. Osborne Morgan, Esq.”

“20, Bolton-street, Piccadilly, W.,

“3rd February, 1872.

“Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 1st instant, which only reached me last evening. I perfectly admit that you are entitled, as one of my constituents

though, as you say, an unwilling one—to require from me an explanation of any assertion made by me at a public meeting. The passage in my Wrexham speech, which you quote, is correctly reported, except that the word ‘valid’ is a misprint for ‘barren.’ But the meaning which you attribute to it is, allow me to say, entirely misconceived. Speaking for myself, personally, I can truly say that I regard the Burial Service of the Church of England as one of the most sublime compositions in our language, and I have never been able to listen to it without emotion. I have stated this both in the House of Commons and elsewhere; indeed, in introducing my Burials’ Bill, I spoke of it as ‘a form of service which is perhaps the most touching message of peace and consolation ever composed by man, when it falls on softened and sympathetic hearts.’ It is possible, nay probable, that many Dissenters may share that opinion. But it is not the use of any particular form of expression, or even the introduction of any particular form of doctrine in the Burial Service, to which Dissenters, as a general rule, object. They object to the compulsory use of a fixed and stereotyped Service *in toto*. Such a Service, however unobjectionable, or even beautiful, in the abstract, if unaccompanied by a single word of prayer or consolation specially adapted to the past life or religious creed of the deceased, or the circumstances or feelings of his surviving relatives or friends, is, I have not the slightest doubt, ‘abhorrent to the feelings of nine-tenths’ of the Dissenters in this country. The best proof of the fact lies in the support which my Bill has received from them. I am sorry you consider the epithet which I applied to the Church Service “opprobrious.” I used it in no such sense, nor is it fairly susceptible of such an interpretation.

“I am, dear sir, yours faithfully,

“G. OSBORNE MORGAN.

“Rev. T. J. Hughes.”

“Llanbedr Rectory, Ruthin,

“February 6, 1872.

“Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your

letter of the 3rd, and to thank you for the explanation you have given me of the paragraph in your speech, to which I had asked your attention.

“ Your explanation is, I admit at once, satisfactory, so far as it removes from my mind a very painful impression I had received from your speech as to your personal convictions. It is satisfactory also, as containing virtually an admission of the utter absence of all sound reason for the invasion of our churchyards, with which you have thought proper to connect your name, and as indirectly supplying evidence of the evil of such a step, even on the religious grounds on which you are pleased to advocate it.

“ I am glad to find that you appreciate at their proper worth the chastened and solacing tone and sentiments of the Burial Service of the Church : but your speech at Wrexham conveys no such impression. I do not profess to be an exact reader of Parliamentary debates, and it is but recently I have become connected with this county. Possibly, therefore, I have not paid to your speeches on other occasions the attention I ought to have done ; but, reading your speech at Wrexham *per se*, so far from having misconceived your meaning, I believe the inference I drew was inevitable, if words are to be interpreted according to the standard of common usage. You spoke of the Burial Service as ‘ abhorrent to the feelings ’ of certain persons. If I use such language, surely I must be understood to mean that there is something to be abhorred for its own sake in the object as to which I profess such aversion ; in other words, I do not know how I am to interpret your words otherwise than as conveying to your hearers that the Burial Service in its subject matter contained sentiments or modes of expression to be abhorred by a religious mind ; but when I ask you to point out *definitely* what these are, you reply by an eloquent, but most just, eulogy on the Service. I thank you for it, and accept it as a valuable admission that the opposition of Dissenters cannot, or ought not, to arise from anything objectionable in the Service itself.

“ It appears, however, from the latter part of your letter, that the objection of Dissenters arises, not so much from what the Service contains, as from what it does not contain. It contains no provision for making special reference to the past life of the deceased, or the circumstances of his death. But does this justify your accusation? Of two modes of discharging the same duty, one may be more gratifying to my feelings than the other; the other may be less pleasing, but does not necessarily become a thing to be loathed.

“ There is another aspect of the question, as to which I ought not to be silent. I understood you to admit the *validity* of the Churchman's right; but this, it appears now, was an error of the printer's. What a ‘barren right’ means, I do not know; but I do ask you what property exists in the whole kingdom, the title to which is more sacred, and which ought to be more inviolate, than that of the Church to her property? The churchyard is God's acre. Your Bill is a throwing down of the fence around it, a laying it open to the service, sacred or profane, of any chance comer; it is an invasion of the rights of property, which can be followed only by an utter unsettling of all the foundations of society. It is becoming rapidly in the School, Church, and Churchyard, a question *pro aris*: it will soon become *pro focis* also.

“ And what reason do you advance for this measure? It is to be done solely to gratify the feelings of certain dissentients. I ask you, as a lawyer, is feeling a sufficient test of right and wrong? It might be very gratifying to my feelings to be declared the possessor of a Ducal estate; but is this sufficient ground on which to establish a title?

“ But allow me to say a word as to the only reason you advance for your Bill—the propriety, on religious grounds, of introducing personal allusions into a Service for the Burial of the Dead. All allusions of the kind must obviously be, more or less, of a laudatory character: failings—and who is without them? would be glossed over; virtues, supposed or real, would be extolled.

The service would be of the nature of a panegyric; it would be for the glory of man, or the glory of the sect, and not for the glory of God. Let me ask you, in all seriousness, is this in accordance with the spirit and teaching of Christianity? Are its ministers to have 'men's persons in admiration' by flattery and by pandering to their vanity? On the contrary, is not the whole tendency of Christianity, as summed up in the Sermon on the Mount, in the opposite direction?

"The Burial Service is an act of Divine worship. Does not natural instinct, and much more, Christian principle, teach the impropriety of addressing the Supreme Being, the Searcher of hearts, the Judge of all mankind, in terms of human praise, which may indeed be very gratifying to our feelings, but which may also be utterly odious in His sight? Is it not far more in the spirit of Christ's religion to content ourselves, as the Church teaches us to do, with the expression of a calm and sober hope as to the final lot of the departed?

"If there should be peculiar circumstances of a domestic nature, as I know there sometimes will be, the home of the family is surely the proper place for administering suitable consolation; or if the departed had been a prominent member of one of the sects, then his own usual place of worship would be the most suitable stage on which to dilate on his labours for his own particular denomination. The Church does not allow allusions of the kind at the burial of the most exalted or attached of her own members; and to extend such a privilege to those who have not only renounced her communion, but who have, perhaps, spent their whole lives in hostility to her, is not merely an act of uncalled-for partiality: it is an aggression, as unlawful in its nature as it is un-Christian in its tendency, and demands the most strenuous opposition on the broad, but solid, principle that it is a measure for the glory of man, and not for the glory of God.

"I am, dear sir, yours truly,

"T. J. HUGHES.

"G. Osborne Morgan, Esq.

"P.S.—These letters have not been written with a view to publication ; but circumstances may be such that I may feel compelled to ask permission, on your part, to send our correspondence to the Press."

"20, Bolton-street, Piccadilly, W.,

"February 7th, 1872.

"Dear Sir,—In reply to your letter of yesterday, I beg to say that I have not the slightest objection to your sending our correspondence to the Press, or making any other use of it you please.

"I am sorry that you persist in attributing to the word 'abhorrent' a meaning which I never intended it to convey. Surely the word is nothing else than the Latin equivalent to 'distasteful.' Perhaps it would have been better to have used the Saxon expression ; but if I may respectfully venture to say so, I hardly expected that it would have been necessary to have explained the meaning of the word to a scholar like yourself.

"I really must decline to enter into any further discussion about the merits of my Burials Bill, particularly as it will soon be discussed publicly.

"I am, dear sir, yours truly,

"GEORGE OSBORNE MORGAN.

"The Rev. T. J. Hughes."

"Llanbedr Rectory, Ruthin,

"13th February, 1872.

"Dear Sir,—Without entering into any subtle discussion as to the distinction between '*eidola specus*' and '*eidola fori*,' it is obvious to observe, as to the word 'abhorrent,' that words, which may be interpreted in one sense in schools of learning, may receive a very different interpretation in the market hall of a Welsh town. Had your address been delivered in the lecture-room of an University, I should, of course, have estimated your words by a different

standard ; but when delivered to an audience consisting largely, I presume, of Welshmen, and certainly circulated through the press among your Welsh constituents, I had to estimate your meaning by the current standard of our own countrymen.

"I have been at the pains of ascertaining the meaning attached to 'abhorrent' in some of our more popular Welsh dictionaries, and the time which this inquiry has taken (for I had not all the volumes at hand) must be my apology for not having replied to you sooner.

"I give you the interpretations :—

"Abhorrent. A fo'n ffeiddio, a fo'n ffaidd ganddo. *Walters.*

"Abhorrent. Atgas, ffaidd, ffeiddiol, a fo'n ffeiddio. *T. Jones.*

"Abhorrent. Atgas, atgasol, ffaidd, casaol, &c. *Edwards (Caer-fallwch).*

"Abhorrent. Atgas, ffaidd, cas, gwrthneuel, dygasol, &c. *Silvan Evans.*

all agreeing that the Welshman is to understand by the word, 'odious, hateful, loathsome,' &c. (Dr. Owen Pughe), and nothing approaching so mild a term as 'distasteful.'

"If English words, derived from Latin sources, are to be interpreted according to various shades of classical usage, I fear our dictionaries will have all to undergo serious revision. But surely you have not forgotten the maxim of Horace, generally considered a high authority among scholars, that in matters of this kind the supreme arbiter is

"usus,

Quem penes arbitrium est et jus et norma loquendi,
and this is the standard by which I have estimated your language.

"But I sink willingly all controversy as to a word in the graver issues which are involved in your Bill; and as I think it desirable that the Churchman's view of the subject should be presented to our countrymen, I shall avail myself of the permission on your part to publish our correspondence.

"I am, dear sir, yours truly,

"T. J. HUGHES.

"G. Osborne Morgan, Esq."

" 20, Bolton-street, Piccadilly,

" February 19th, 1872.

" Dear Sir,—I have to apologise for not answering your letters before, but a great pressure of business prevented me from so doing. I regret that my numerous and pressing engagements do not permit me to enter into the verbal controversy to which, according to your last letter, our differences seem to be reduced.

" Believe me, yours faithfully,

" G. OSBORNE MORGAN.

" The Rev. T. J. Hughes."

" Llanbedr Rectory, Ruthin,

" 21st February, 1872.

" Dear Sir,—Most glad should I be if the difference between us were reduced to the small compass of the meaning of a word. I can quite understand that your engagements are numerous and pressing; but, amid them all, allow me to remind you that you have not touched my arguments as to *two* most important points.

" 1. The right of the Church to the free and undisturbed use of her property. If Sir William Blackstone, at least, is an authority, our ancient parish churches were erected by the *Thanes* of old, as churches are erected by members of the Church to this day, and, with their endowments, were a gift to the Church, quite as much as the endowments which several of the Dissenting bodies have in different parts of the country are gifts to them. If Dissenters object to the Burial Service of the Church, let them, by all means, be relieved from the pain of having its comforting language addressed to them, though I am bold to say that the great mass of religious Dissenters entertain no objection of the kind, except as far as it is urged upon them by a few ambitious preachers. But it is a perversion of terms to say that civil and religious liberty requires that the sects should intrude into the Church's heritage with a service of their own, quite as much as I presume it would be allowed to be that the Roman Catholic should have the power to enter the Calvinistic Methodists' burial ground, and celebrate a service there with crucifix and thuribule, and all

the emblems of the Roman Catholic ritual. Instead of healing divisions, is it not plain that your Bill must draw the line between Church and Dissent more distinct than ever? Now Churchmen and Dissenters meet at the same grave, and often bury their differences, a kind of presage of a happier and more enduring union in the life beyond.

"Liberty! Alas! it is possible to use so precious a gift as *Epikalumma tes kakias*—a veil of mischief.

"2. The evil of personal allusion in prayer unto God. This is, I believe, indulged in largely by Dissenters at their burial services, and springs, as I have already observed, either from vanity, or from the Pharisaism which says, 'I am holier than thou.' Churchmen have the most conscientious objections, on the highest grounds of religion, that their churchyards should be profaned by such utterances, and that they should very often, from the contiguity of the parsonage to the churchyard, have to submit to the pain of listening to matter so offensive. But I suppose Churchmen have no consciences, or have no right to have their conscientious convictions regarded in the least.

"One word more, and I have done. The Roman Catholic is true to his Church and Creed. The Dissenting laity are zealous and outspoken in the defence and support of their respective denominations. Thank God, the Church, too, has a small and devoted phalanx, even in the House of Commons. But I can scarcely conceive a more false and humiliating position than that of one who calls himself a Churchman, who pronounces a beautiful eulogy upon the Burial Service, and yet becomes the leader of the crew who are about to banish that service, as far as they can, from our churches and churchyards.

"Well may the Church take up the lament of the prophet and say, 'I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against me.'

"I am, sir, yours, &c.,

"T. J. HUGHES.

"G. Osborne Morgan, Esq."

The following letter on the subject also appeared in the *Wrexham Guardian* :—

THE REAL MEANING OF A WORD.

To the Editor of the *Wrexham Guardian*.

Sir,—Mr. Morgan, in one of his letters to the Rector of Llanbedr, assures him that the word “abhorrent” is nothing else than the Latin equivalent to “distasteful,” and expresses some surprise that it should be necessary to offer that explanation to a correspondent who is admittedly a scholar.

I have looked at three English dictionaries which are usually referred to—namely, Bailey’s, Dr. Johnson’s, and Richardson’s, and I do not find the words “distasteful” or “distaste” in any explanation of “abhorrent,” “abhorrence,” or “abhor.”

Mr. Bailey tells us that to abhor is “to loathe or hate, to detest, to abominate.” Dr. Johnson says it is “to hate with acrimony, to detest to extremity, to loathe, to abominate.” And Dr. Richardson, that it is “to dislike or detest, to loathe, to disdain, to abominate, to be averse from, opposed or contrary to, inconsistent with.”

“Abhorrent,” says Dr. Johnson, is an adjective from abhor. And he gives as its first signification—“struck with abhorrence, loathing;” as its second—“contrary to, foreign from, inconsistent with.”

Before our English dictionaries are altered to suit the convenience of our member, and in obedience to his dictum, it will be well to correct several, if not all, our Latin ones. Scheller notices, in his *Lexicon*, that the proper meaning of “abhorrere” is “to shrink back from with a shudder,” and he nowhere offers “to be distasteful to” as a suitable translation for it. Our old acquaintance, Ainsworth, is still less pardonable; he has “abhorrens” in one portion of his dictionary and “distasteful” in another, but he does not translate either word by the other, in the same profound ignorance that they are equivalent, which, until Mr. Morgan’s recent explanation, was the condition of,

Sir, your obedient servant,

February 29th.

A CONSTANT READER.

SUPPLEMENTARY REMARKS.

Mr. Osborne Morgan grounded his argument for his Burials' Bill, in the above correspondence, so exclusively upon what may be called the *sentimental* view of the question, that the principles of right and wrong, which are involved in it, have not, I think, been sifted as closely as it is desirable they should be. Let me ask the reader to give his calm attention to the following statement. The Nonconformists, by continued agitation, obtained a Bill granting them exemption from liability to all payments as to the proper care of Churches and Churchyards, alleging as a reason that, as they maintained their own places of worship and graveyards, so Churchmen should maintain theirs. Having thus virtually shifted the entire cost and charge of the maintenance of Churches and Churchyards upon *Churchmen alone*, they now come forward with a bold front, and claim that they have a right, with very few limitations, to use the Churchyard just as they please, to be followed, doubtless, in due course, by a claim to use the Church also.

Now, in order to have a clearer aspect, perhaps, of the bearings of the question, let me, for a moment, take it out of the region of religious polemics, and exemplify it by a parallel case in civil matters. Suppose a Museum and a Public Park were attached to a town. The Park grounds require to be kept in order, and, as they are for the use and benefit of the whole community, it is proposed that the expense should be defrayed out of a Town-rate. But suppose a number of residents in the town to say, "We have a club-room and garden of our own which we maintain, and which

we prefer to yours ; we object to your rate ; ” and by continued agitation the dissentients obtain exemption from the public park-rate. But, after a *very few* years, suppose the very same persons to turn round and say, “ We are burgesses ; we live within the bounds of the borough ; we demand of right to use the park just as we please ; only of course *you* will continue to *pay for* keeping it in order, while *we* are to be exempt.” Let me ask, can such conduct be reconciled with those principles of truth and uprightness, which ought to regulate the proceedings of honourable and truly conscientious men ? And yet it appears to me that it is the exact counterpart of what is proposed to be done by means of Mr. Morgan’s Burials’ Bill.

Perhaps the illustration I have used above will help us also to understand what Mr. Morgan means, by what he is pleased to call the Churchman’s “ barren right.” The Churchman’s *barren* right, it appears, is the right to use the Churchyard, and to *pay* for its proper care and enclosure. The Dissenter’s *profitable* right is the right to use the Churchyard and *not to pay*. Very profitable, doubtless ; but the less said about conscience the better.

Let it be carefully remembered, that this Burials’ Bill grievance is admitted to be a grievance of *sentiment* only. But if every imaginary grievance of sentiment is to be redressed at the sacrifice of truth and honour, what must be the result ? For instance, the Alabama claims, in their latest development, are an outgrowth of a grievance of sentiment ; and, according to his own principles, Mr. Morgan would yield to pressure, if brought to bear with sufficient power upon him, and would move that the claims be admitted to their fullest extent.

Mr. Morgan referred in his speech to the common law right of every parishioner to be buried in his parish Church-

yard. No one disputes this ; but Mr. M. knows well that this right is the result of that union between Church and State, which dates back almost from the first birth of our national life, and which has been interwoven with all our national institutions. He knows well that, according to the terms of the compact, the Church has an equally indefeasible right to the use of her Service at burials, or, under certain circumstances, of *no* service at all. If the State demands an alteration in the terms of the arrangement, then surely the Church, as one of the joint contracting parties, has a right to be heard. If the claim to interment be still maintained (and no one objects to it), it was never in the bond, that every funeral party should demand and exercise the right to use any religious service they please, as is proposed by Mr. M.'s Bill, any more than that every parishioner, who claims, as he can by common law, a seat in the Parish Church, shall also claim the right to supersede the Church's Service and Creed by inventions of his own.

Moreover, let us trace this Bill to its necessary results ; not only will it empower the Roman Catholic priest to enter our churchyards and celebrate a service according to the Creed of his Church ; not only will it give a legal *status* to schismatics and heretics of every shade and hue, to the latest development of Shakerism,* within the precincts of God's consecrated Acre—more than this, if I understand the Bill rightly, any religious service will be legal. In these days of extensive commercial enterprise and intercourse of nations, when men of all Creeds are to be found on our Exchanges, in our Law Courts, and at our Universities, it is no stretch of imagination to suppose interment in a Parochial Churchyard claimed for a Jew, Mormon, Turk, or Parsee,

* See the London Police Reports of last month.

accompanied with a religious service according to the belief of one or other. The Bill, in its original form, contained no distinctive recognition of Christianity. Moreover, whatever recognition it contains now is due, not to Mr. Morgan or any of his friends, but solely to the Conservatives; and the circumstances, under which an amendment to that effect has been introduced into the Bill, deserve notice. When it was proposed in 1870, that the religious service, other than that of the Church of England, should consist of the reading of a portion of Holy Scripture, a prayer, and a hymn, Mr. Morgan and his friends rejected the proposal with disdain. Now, however, when they are opening their eyes to the discovery that the people of England are not so eager to accept Secularism as their creed, and that they are ready to say as to their *Church*, what the poet says of old England—

— With all thy faults, I love thee still,

the same amendment, when proposed this year by Mr. J. G. Talbot, one of the Conservative members for Kent, is graciously accepted. Thus the recognition of the Word of God, as an essential part of the religious service, is due solely and exclusively to the Conservatives; but no limitation can be applied to the remainder of the service. In other words, the Bill both in its conception and in its tendency is, if of any religion, simply pantheistic; according to it, Christianity is no longer the one True Religion—it is only one of the many forms of Faith prevailing in the world. The Church is to be dethroned from her proper function, as “The pillar and ground of the Truth” (St. Paul i. Tim. iii. 15), and it requires but a very slight development of the principles of this Bill to enact by law, that Pantheism is to be the future Creed of England, and that our consecrated

Churchyards, instead of being places of Christian Burial, and our ancient Parish Churches, instead of being places of Christian worship, are to become virtually Pantheistic Cemetaries and Cemetery Chapels !

Mr. Morgan may say, as I hope he will be able to say that he contemplated no such consequences ; but I do not think he can deny my inferences. His object throughout is that a " religious service," whether Christian or not, may be conducted in our Churchyards.* But when he knows, as he must know, that the Bill will inflict upon his fellow-Churchmen a grievance infinitely more galling than any which can be alleged, even upon Mr. M.'s own showing, in behalf of his Dissenting friends, let me entreat him to abandon this abominable Bill.

Let me also, with all the seriousness the subject demands, ask earnest and religious men among the various bodies of Dissenters, whether they are prepared for this ? Is a Bill which opens the door to results such as these, in their opinion, a just and righteous Bill ? What would they say, if a Bill were submitted to Parliament empowering a Roman Catholic Priest, or even a Church of England clergyman, to enter their places of worship and hold a service, each according to his respective Ritual ? They will thus perhaps be better able to understand and appreciate the grounds of the hostility, which Churchmen cannot but entertain towards this measure on the deepest conscientious and religious convictions. Let me entreat my fellow Churchmen also, for the

* I find two limitations. (1) The Service must be that of " a religious body having a registered place of worship." The Mormon Creed is, but the Moslem and the Parsee Creeds are not as yet in Mr. Horace Mann's catalogue ; but when, to say nothing of Mormons, such denominations as " Free-thinkers, Rational Progressionists, Southcottians, &c., &c.," satisfy the legal condition, it is obvious that the recognition of Cristianity may be the very slightest, even among religious bodies, by a figure of speech, called Christian. (2) Churchyards given to the Church within the last 50 years *may* be exempt. That is to say, Christianity was introduced into England and the Church of England founded in the year 1822.

honour of God, to bestir themselves and offer their most strenuous resistance to this most offensive Erastian measure.

The only adequate solution, it seems to me, is that which has been arrived at by the Church in her Convocation, and which has been embodied in Lord Beauchamp's Bill. Let increased facilities be provided for enabling Nonconformists to have graveyards of their own; meanwhile let them retain their right to sepulture in the Churchyard, and if they desire to dispense with the Burial Service of the Church, let them be empowered to do so, their own service being held at their own place of worship, and not in the churchyard. And let not this be maligned as being "the burial of a dog;" for I am informed that, even where Dissenters have graveyards of their own, their distinctive Burial Service is always held in their Chapels. and, when the body is laid in the grave, not a word of prayer is said. An address is delivered; but even Mr. Morgan abandons this, as open to abuse. Let this then be accepted as a compromise; let their own Service be held in their own Chapel, as is the case now; and if the remains are brought to the Churchyard for interment, let them be deposited quietly in the grave without the Church Service, if so desired.*

To this the Churchman is prepared to assent. The Dissenter has, virtually, declared his approval of it; and we shall be spared the continued jealousies and heartburnings, which, if nothing worse, must be the result of Mr. Morgan's Burials' Bill.

* The Lord's Prayer, and "The Grace of our Lord, &c.," might be suitably said at the grave; but the prejudice of some Dissenters against "Forms of sound words" is so strong that, I fear, they would object even to these, though a very part of Holy Writ, and though Scripture gives express sanction to such forms. (ii. Tim. i. 13.)

T. J. H.







